



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

trunk. The classical schools of Indian philosophy neglect the term, but the web and woof of the whole show it in its vigorous vitality. The Buddhists restore the word to its pristine glory, but they deprive it of its real significance" (p. 189). "They tear down the two main pillars which carry the mighty dome of religion, the ideas Brahma and Ātman" (p. 190). "The ideal of salvation is based upon a philosophical system which reached its highest expression in the Brahma-Nirvāṇa. The building stones of Buddhism have been quarried from the Sāṃkhya of the epic age; and this system was a strict Brahman, not a Buddhist philosophy. It rested upon revealed wisdom and was supported by logical inquiry without being rationalistic. Although it excluded in its theoretical department the worship of a highest Lord, it accepted as its aim and ideal the belief in Brahma" (p. 190).

Dahlmann defends his position ably, but we do not believe that he will convince any Sanskritist of prominence. The existence of an older Sāṃkhya school, such as he assumes to have been, is an ingenious but highly improbable hypothesis. The proofs which he adduces in the present book are, to say the least, insufficient.

PAUL CARUS.

CHICAGO, ILL.

THE PREACHING OF ISLAM. A History of the Propagation of the Muslim Faith. By T. W. ARNOLD, B.A., late Scholar of Magdalene College, Cambridge; Professor of Philosophy, Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental College, Aligarh, India. Westminster: Archibald Constable & Co., 1896; New York: New Amsterdam Book Co. \$3.50.

THIS is a book which had to be written. That it should come was inevitable, and it is well that it has come, for it marks a definite stage in the development of our knowledge of Islam. How one-sided that knowledge once was it is hardly necessary to say. It was misleading, inaccurate, and generally wrong-headed. That stage is passing, and such a book as this will help it to pass. We have here another side, strictly *one* other side, equally misleading and wrong-headed with the old view, but, as a complement to it, unavoidable and, therefore, to be welcomed. It is a distinct movement forward, though forward on a slant; some day we shall get the resultant of all these movements and shall find what is the real drift.

The object of the book is given excellently in the chief title, *The Preaching of Islam*. It is an attempt to give a history of the propaga-

tion of Islam by what we would call missionary methods. It thus fills a gap which Arabists and students of the Muslim East have long painfully felt. It also reveals a side of Muslim life which will probably be very new and very surprising. That Islam is a great missionary religion would perhaps be granted in a dim kind of way ; how great it is as a missionary religion probably few, even of the readers of this JOURNAL, have realized. Its spread in Africa we know after a fashion—Africa is prominent just now—but the rate at which it is coving the Malay archipelago will probably come as a surprise to most. Still more of a surprise is it to learn that there are about twenty or thirty—one authority says seventy—million Chinese Muslims. The shock is not nearly so great to learn that there are a hundred or two of Teutonic and Latin blood. Then, after that, we are hardly at all surprised to learn that “the faith of Islam extends from Morocco to Zanzibar, from Sierra Leone to Siberia and China, from Bosnia to New Guinea,” and that “Indian coolies have carried the faith of Islam to the West India islands and to British and Dutch Guiana.”

Mr. Arnold's arrangement of his material is simple. First comes an introductory chapter in defense of the missionary character of Islam. Next a chapter on Muhammad as a preacher and as a pattern for the Muslim missionary. His life is told so far as it bears on that side of his works, and the idea put before us is that of a prophet with a new religious teaching reluctantly forced into founding and building up a temporal power. To this view of Muhammad's life we shall also have to return. Then the spread of Islam among the Christian peoples of western Asia is sketched ; the causes in both cases, and their condition under Arab rule ; finally, the approximation which grew up between the Muslims and the crusaders. Then, in a series of chapters, he treats of the spread of Islam in Christian Africa, in Spain, among the Christian nations of Europe under the Turks, in Persia and central Asia, among the Mongols and Tartars, in India, in China, in Africa, in the Malay archipelago. This part of the book is very well done and exhibits great width of reading and skill in marshaling facts. Of course, exception can be taken here and there to particular statements, and a general exception could be taken to the tone, but this is the part of the book which makes it worth reading and using. In the earlier chapters and in the concluding chapter the writer holds a brief for Islam and lacks the clear, simple objectivity that marks the true historian. His associations and professorial duties have evidently given him a bias similar, but opposed, to that which dominated the

earlier European writers upon Muhammad and Islam. He has not reached the balance of the modern, especially the German, investigators in this department; he has read the books of Goldziher, von Kremer, Snouck Hurgronje, Krehl, Robertson Smith, and the rest, but has not perfectly caught their spirit. His weakness is not, as he seems to fear in his preface, the accuracy of his statements of fact, but the interpretation and scheme of history into which he too often forces these facts. Over the condition of the pre-Muslim Arabs, the origin of Islam, the story of Muhammad, and the earliest development of Islam and its state, there have been and still are furious conflicts, but the dust is now beginning to clear away, and the picture shaping itself before us is not in all respects that which Mr. Arnold champions.

I shall now enter into some details of criticism, general and particular. In the first place—and this is the most general criticism which I shall have to bring forward—the subtitle is, to say the least, unfortunate. It is true that this book is about “the preaching of Islam,” but it is not about “the propagation of the Muslim faith” in the broad sense, but only about the propagation as worked by preaching and missionary effort. Muhammad certainly never taught, though some of his followers may have done so, that force should be used to make converts, but that is not to say that the spread of the faith he preached was due to preaching only. The great point to grasp is that Islam is not simply a religion, a faith, but is a political and legal system as well; Islam covers all corporate as well as private life. If the scheme of Pope Gregory VII had been carried out and the papacy had become the temporal as well as the spiritual head of Christendom, the Christian religion, as codified and developed by the Roman See, would have been in the position of the faith of Islam; otherwise not. Muhammad as a private preacher at Mecca could be compared to a missionary in the western sense, but there is no comparison possible between such a missionary and Muhammad at Medina, the absolute sovereign of Arabia, however zealously he might preach the faith and proclaim that there should be no compulsion in Islam. And, so, wherever the Muslim faith goes, it is incomplete until it embodies itself in a Muslim state. In the history of Christian missions the aims and aspirations of the Society of Jesus have come nearest to those of the Muslim propagandists. It is true that Muslim missionaries are individualistic to a degree. They go out each for himself, and have no such organization directing and controlling them as that of the Society of Jesus. But the results of their efforts are, or seek to be, the same;

they do not simply spread a faith, they found states. That is what is actually happening in Africa ; it is what happened in the Malay archipelago, until checked by European influence ; it is what is feared in China, and it is what would certainly happen in India if the English rule were removed. This difference is hardly to be met by saying (p. 33) that "it was no part of his [Muhammad's] teaching to say, 'My kingdom is not of this world.' " It is so emphatically of this world that its ideal can only be reached by controlling and shaping all the institutions of this world, political as well as religious. It was certainly not preaching and missionary effort that carried Islam within a century to Samarqand, beyond the Oxus, and to Tours in southern France, and founded the widest empire that has ever been ; nor could these have brought the Turks twice to the walls of Vienna ; nor could even Muhammad's eloquence have made him the absolute ruler of Arabia before he died. The point remains firm that Islam spreads by what we would call missionary effort only when it is debarred from spreading by its own weight, and Mr. Arnold shows this when he remarks (p. 346) on the fact that it has been preached most zealously in countries where Muslims did not rule, and that missionary efforts died down where Muslims did rule. Nor can this difference be put aside by drawing attention to Charlemagne's bloody conversion of the pagan Saxons, or to the violent labors of the Teutonic knights, or the Jesuit missionaries. The story of those things would have to enter a history of the propagation of the Christian faith, however they might be viewed by the historian. And, similarly, a history of the propagation of the Muslim faith, to be complete and balanced, must take account of all things that have gone to spread it, whether direct persecution, weight of state influence, burden of taxation, personal insecurity, or peaceful preaching. And then there remains the essential difference that Christianity deals with religious things only, but Islam only realizes its own ideal in a Muslim state ; these things are excrescences on the Christianity of a time, they inhere in the essential nature of Islam.

Again, on p. 4, Mr. Arnold speaks of "that mythical personage, the Muslim warrior, with sword in one hand and Qur'an in the other," and wishes to put in his place "the quiet, unobtrusive labors of the preacher and trader." The Muslim warrior exactly as so described is certainly mythical, but a very little change in the description will bring out a true historical figure. The alternative was not of sword or Qur'an, but of sword, Qur'an, or tribute. This Mr. Arnold himself states on p. 46, and it shows at once the nature of a Muslim con-

quest. It is a conquest in a real sense, but the burden of conquest is on a religious basis. Further, what was the nature of this "tribute"? Mr. Arnold has used von Kremer's *Kulturgeschichtliche Streifzüge*, but he does not seem to have grasped the true character of the constitution of 'Umar, which von Kremer was the first to state clearly in that little book. For the inhabitants of Arabia under that constitution the choice was Qur'ān or exile—Arabia was to be reserved as a sacred soil for Muslims. Outside of Arabia no Muslim might hold land; when a country was conquered, it was left in the hands of its original owners, with the obligation of paying a heavy rent tax for it to the Muslim state, also of paying a poll tax for each non-Muslim, and of furnishing all the necessities of life to the Muslim army of occupation which inhabited the camp cities built to hold the conquered countries. Thus the Muslims were preserved as a warrior caste, a fighting machine, with fighting as their only work; they were supported by the subject peoples. This system was communistic, but it was a one-sided communism, in favor of one class. The Muslims would not buy—were not permitted to—and their fellows could not, for with the land went the rent tax. They could only embrace Islam, and, then, if they did, their land was taken from them and distributed among their former coreligionists; they themselves passed into the favored caste and received their share of the money paid into the state treasury. Naturally, they did embrace Islam, and to such an extent that the revenues were very seriously affected by the falling off in the poll tax. For this reason the constitution of 'Umar eventually broke down; converts were compelled to pay the poll tax or a part of it, and Muslims began to hold land outside of Arabia. It was revived for a time by the pious Umayyad Khalifa 'Umar II [A. D. 717-20], but after his death again ceased. Under such a system as this it is easy to see how Islam spread.

Returning to the life of Muhammad, as sketched here, we find the position taken up that all his wars were defensive,² that he was forced into a career of conquest. There are strong elements of humor here. Of course, it may be possible to contend that each forward movement on the part of Muhammad was forced from him by his enemies, but it is remarkable how these forward movements gradually brought him to the complete sovereignty of Arabia.

Again, passing to the account of the early conquests of the Muslims after the death of Muhammad, much too great stress is laid on their religious fervor as a cause of their success. Undoubtedly, Islam

unified them and made their national existence more permanent, but Muhammad, the prophet, would have effected little, had he not also led a national movement and been succeeded and aided by great leaders. This character of the movement is shown by the fact, which Mr. Arnold himself gives (p. 44), though to prove quite a different thing, that Christian Arabs fought side by side with Muslims in the early wars.

Four appendices of great interest are added to the book. In the first of these the meaning of *jihād* is discussed, and all the passages in the Qur'ān where the root occurs are quoted. It is contended (1) that the Qur'ān does not teach forcible conversion, (2) that it does not authorize unprovoked attack on unbelievers, (3) that the use of *jihād* in the sense of "warfare against unbelievers" is post-Qur'ānic. The first point we can readily admit; the second we may admit also, but when the rider is added that all the wars of Muhammad were defensive, we can only admit that in a very Pickwickian sense; the third is quite improbable, and it is hard to see how it can be maintained in the face of such passages as ix : 41, 82, 87, with their distinction between those who fought and those who stayed at home. In the second appendix the well-known letter of al-Hāshimī (whoever he was) addressed to al-Kindī (whoever *he* was), inviting him to embrace Islam, is given in translation. The whole question of the apology of this al-Kindī has still to be worked out, but I cannot agree with Mr. Arnold that the document has necessarily been mutilated. Third comes a brief appendix upon controversial literature between Muslims and others, and, fourth, one of great interest upon converts to Islam who have not come under direct missionary influence. The greater part is taken up by a translation from the *Tuhfatu-l-adīb* (not *arīb*, as printed) by 'Abdu-llāh ibn 'Abdi-llāh, a Christian priest who went over to Islam. He wrote in 1420 and gives in his work, an attack on Christianity and defense of Islam, an account of his own early life and conversion. Mr. Arnold seems to accept this as trustworthy throughout. To me the story of Nicolas Martil, the aged priest of Bologna, and how he secretly expounded to 'Abdu-llāh the Paraclete of John 14 : 16, 16 : 7, as a prophecy of Muhammad, is only a degree less evidently apocryphal than the similar story Sale translates from the preface to the Muslim Spanish form of the gospel of St. Barnabas, in which Pope Sixtus V and his private library play a part. It is curious that in this story there is no reference to the corruption of *περικλυτός* into *παράκλητος* that appears so often in Muslim apolo-

getic. That 'Abdu-llāh ibn 'Abdi-llāh had been a Christian priest, and one, too, of some learning, the quotations from his book given by Hughes in the *Dictionary of Islām* (pp. 212 f.) seem to make certain. That he told lies about his early life seems to me equally certain.

I have marked a number of other points of interest, but can touch here upon only one more. On p. 50 Mr. Arnold gives the well-known instructions issued to the army of Syria by Abū Bakr on its first expedition. As commonly translated, a distinction was made between hermits and priests; the former were to be left in peace, but the latter slain. The last phrase *fakhfiqūhum bis-sayfi khafqā* he translates *touch them only with the flat of the sword*, and explains this as done in sign of authority. This rendering is certainly borne out by the regular meaning of the root *khfq* and gives a fairly good meaning, though not so pointed as the older version. Still, when we consider that *daraba 'unqahu* does not mean simply *he struck his neck*, but *he cut off his head*, *khfq* may have had a stronger meaning. Yet it is only fair to add that ath-Tha'ālibī in the *Fiqh* gives *khfq* as the word to use for a blow with a shoe (*na'ī*), but *ḍrb* for a sword.

But what, it may be asked, is the net result of this book? Undoubtedly, we have in it a clear picture of one side of Muslim religious activity, which has been dim to us, if not quite unknown. We see here the single Muslim missionaries, belonging, perhaps, to some one of the great Darwīsh fraternities, perhaps quite unattached, perhaps merchants traveling for gain, perhaps prisoners in a foreign land; theologians and men unlettered, wandering mystics with strange claims to miracle, and men of business with an eye to the main chance, kings and beggars, men and women, we see them all doing their work in the station to which God has called them for the spread of their faith. Undoubtedly, the conquests of the Muslim faith, so preached, have been great. Almost all lands have known them; almost all have yielded them converts. And when the convert has been gained, he has been gained to an extent that modern Christian missions have not accomplished. The African Muslim and the Chinese Muslim stand beside the Arab, the Persian, and the Indian in close social fellowship. It has always been so. Christianity, too, in its earlier days, with its earliest missionaries, had this power; then it, too, was a real brotherhood that stood solid against all the powers of the outside world. But that seems irrecoverably past; the Christian nations, for better or worse, have reached a stage of development that cannot assimilate the half-savage convert. Except in the rarest instances, he remains out-

side the pale, perhaps accepting his position, perhaps repelled by it to rejection at last of the faith itself.

Another point that has greatly aided the success of Muslim missionary efforts is the character of that faith. Although it has given birth to a theology of the greatest elaboration and subtlety, it can be put in a form understandable to the most primitive mind. In this not the very crudest form of "evangelical" Christianity can equal it. Thus it has appealed and must appeal to half-savage races, which can be reached and moved by its rationalism in faith and practical realism in life and morals, far sooner than by the idealism taught by Christianity in both spheres. And, with this help thus given them, there can be no doubt as to the advance made by many of these races. This has especially been seen in the Muslim negro states growing up in central Africa. Islam has certainly meant a new life for them. It has been maintained—and the position is at least defensible—that for the negro in his present state Islam is fitted to do more good than Christianity; it is undoubted that it has spread more easily and spontaneously. What, however, will be the future of those races, whether they will ever emerge from the *cul-de-sac* which Islam has proved to be for every other race, lies in the future; we can only fear.

Finally, I would most earnestly urge upon all who are interested in missions the importance of reading this book carefully. There is much to be learned from it. They will see in it Islam at its best, a living and life-giving Islam which must be known to be met. Our organized mission effort can learn from the absolutely unorganized work of the Muslims what single men can do; it can learn how the missionary must adapt himself; and it can learn, most of all, how the old brotherhood in Christ must be restored, if his kingdom is to come.

DUNCAN B. MACDONALD.

HARTFORD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

DIE NATURWISSENSCHAFT IN IHREM SCHULDVERHÄLTNISS ZUM CHRISTENTHUM. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Skizze. Von Lic. MÄRTENSEN LARSEN, Pfarrer in Vejlbj bei Aarhus. Berlin: Verlag von Reuther & Reichard, 1897. Pp. iv + 90, 8vo. M. 1.60.

THIS brochure of 90 pages, translated by the author himself from the Danish into German, aims, as its title states, to show the indebtedness of natural science to Christianity. The motto, taken from the late